REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **1 November 2007**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-3, 5-15, 17-27, and 29-40. Claims 1, 6, 8-9, 13, 18, 20-21, 25, 30, 32-33, and 37-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Miller (USPN 6,597,358, hereinafter "Miller"). Claims 2-3, 7, 10-11, 14-15, 19, 22-23, 26-27, 31 and 34-35, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Miller, and Horvitz et al. (USPN 5,880,733, hereinafter "Horvitz").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-3, 5-15, 17-27, and 29-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Miller. Applicant respectfully points out that Miller is fundamentally distinct from the embodiments of the present invention. The Miller system is limited to rotating an object at a given location in the application workspace (i.e., rotating the object in place).

In the section of Miller originally cited by the Examiner in rejecting the language "rotating a window around at least one of a horizontal or vertical axis so that the window's contents remain visible while the window occupies less space" in the original claim 1 of the instant application, Miller describes rotating the cube to allow a user to view the other surfaces on the cube:

> Turning now to FIG. 6, an alternative embodiment of the 3D meta-visualization is shown. In this particular embodiment, the contents of the bitmaps 310 could be mapped onto the surfaces 620 of a three-dimensional cube 610 by the graphics rendering unit 250. **The user could view all the surfaces 620 of the cube 610, and, thus, all of the computer applications mapped thereon, by rotating the cube 610 in a predetermined direction via the user-input device 240**. This may be accomplished by receiving a first predetermined input at the user-input device 240 to cause the cube 610 to rotate horizontally. Or, alternatively, receiving a second predetermined input that may cause the cube 610 to rotate vertically (see col. 6, lines 37-49 of Miller).

As indicated in this section, the Miller system is limited to rotating the cube to allow a user to view another face of the cube. For example, in the Miller system, a user can click on the cube in order to rotate the cube so that the contents of the window that were in the top face (or a side face) of the cube are placed in the front face of the cube. Nothing in Miller discloses **moving or rotating the cube around a viewpoint or another point within the 3D space**.

In contrast, embodiments of the present invention allow a user to move or rotate objects within the 3D display model **around a viewpoint or another point within the 3D display model** (see par. [0052] and [0061] of the instant application). In other words, embodiments of the present invention allow a user to **move or rotate a window** from one location to another within the 3D display model around a predetermined point in the 3D display model and/or around a predetermined point ***outside*** **of the 3D display model**. As discussed in the phone conversation of 07 February 2008, rotating a cube in place is *not equivalent* to moving or rotating a window within the 3D display model around a viewpoint or another point. This rotational motion makes it easier for a user to identify window boundaries and also gives the user a feeling of depth and space (see par. [0061 of the instant application).

The Miller system is limited to rotating an object horizontally or vertically at a location in the application workspace. Nothing in Miller discloses **rotating the individual windows around a viewpoint or another point within the 3D display model**.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended claims 1, 13, 25, and 37 to clarify that embodiments of the present invention allow a user to move or rotate the application windows around a viewpoint or another point in a 3D display model.

These amendments find support in pars. [0052] and [0061] of the instant application. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 13, 25, and 37 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-3 and 5-12, which depend upon claim 1, claims 14-15 and 17-24, which depend upon claim 13, claims 26-27 and 29-36, which depend upon claim 25, and claims 38-40, which depend on claim 37, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By __/Anthony Jones/_____
Anthony Jones
Registration No. 59,521

Date: 29 February 2008

Anthony Jones
Park, Vaughan & Fleming LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1666
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: tony@parklegal.com